

REMARKS

In response to the final office action, Applicant amends the claims to expressly recite two different programmable rules that cause an update to be requested. These rules respond to different triggering events.

A first programmable rule is associated with the first cache. This first rule is configured to cause an update of content stored in the first cache upon the occurrence of a first triggering event. A *second* programmable rule is associated with the second cache. This second programmable rule causes an updated of content stored in the second cache upon occurrence of a *different* triggering event. As a result, an event that triggers one rule to refresh the contents of its associate cache need not trigger the other rule to refresh the contents of *its* cache. The two caches are thus able to refresh their respective contents *independently* of each other.

Challenger fails to teach this. As best understood, *Challenger* teaches a system having a trigger monitor 3000 that detects an event, such as a change in the content of the database 3010. Presumably, the Examiner considers this event to be a "triggering event." The trigger monitor 3000 then communicates the occurrence of this *same* triggering event to each remote node 3108. Thus, all the cache managers 3001 see the *same* triggering event provided by the trigger monitor 3000. There is no teaching or suggestion in *Challenger* of implementing a second programmable rule that defines a second triggering event that is *different from* a first triggering event, as recited in amended claim 1.

Independent claims 1, 13, and 19 have been amended to clearly recite separate programmable rules associated with separate caches. The corresponding dependent claims have been amended to conform to their respective parent claims. Additional amendments have been made throughout to more concisely express the subject matter of the invention.

With regards to independent claim 13, which stands rejected as being rendered obvious by *Toemann* and *Challenger*, Applicant notes that *Toemann* fails to teach the claim limitations absent from *Challenger*. Accordingly, claim 13 and its progeny are allowable for the same reasons discussed above in connection with claim 1 and 19.

Applicant : Mark E. Kriegsman and Benjamin W.
Wyckoff
Serial No. : 09/668,110
Filed : September 22, 2000
Page : 9 of 9

Attorney's Docket No.: 11125-014001

No fees are believed to be due in connection with the filing of this response. However, to the extent fees are due, or if a refund is forthcoming, please adjust our deposit account 06-1050 referring to Attorney Docket No. "11125-014001."

Respectfully submitted,

Date: November 22, 2009



Faustino A. Lichauco
Reg. No. 41,942

Fish & Richardson P.C.
225 Franklin Street
Boston, MA 02110-2804
Telephone: (617) 542-5070
Facsimile: (617) 542-8906
20980420.doc